

SEC. 6054. TENNESSEE COLONY LAKE, TEXAS.

The project for navigation, Tennessee Colony Lake, Trinity River, Texas, authorized by section 204 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1091), is not authorized.

SEC. 6055. CITY WATERWAY, TACOMA, WASHINGTON.

The portion of the project for navigation, City Waterway, Tacoma, Washington, authorized by the first section of the Act of June 13, 1902 (32 Stat. 347), consisting of the last 1,000 linear feet of the inner portion of the Waterway beginning at Station 70+00 and ending at Station 80+00, is not authorized.

SEC. 6056. KANAWHA RIVER, CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA.

The project for bank erosion, Kanawha River, Charleston, West Virginia, authorized by section 603(f)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4153), is not authorized.

Mr. BOND. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. I thank all Senators for the passage of this very important bill. There has been tremendous bipartisan cooperation. I especially thank Senator JEFFORDS and Catharine Ransom, JoEllen Darcy, and the great leadership of our chairman, Senator INHOFE. He did an outstanding job, with the great help of Angie Giancarlo, Ruth Van Mark and Stephen Aaron.

On my staff I express a special thanks to a fellow, Letmon Lee, who has worked on this tirelessly for better than 2 years, Karla Klingner, on my staff, Brian Klippenstein, who worked so hard. I believe we have a product we can take to the House.

It is long overdue that we pass the Water Resources Development Act. It was due to be passed in 2002. We have finally done it. My thanks to both sides.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I commend the Senator for his statement. I concur with him wholeheartedly. Let's get on with it.

Mr. BOND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 9

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday at 9:30 a.m. the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 521, H.R. 9, the Voting Rights Act. I further ask there be 8 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees with no amendments in order to the bill, and that following the use or yielding of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on passage without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, since we will be proceeding to the Voting Rights Act tomorrow morning at 9:30, I thought you would be interested to know, since you are on the Judiciary Committee, there will be no executive committee meeting because Senator LEAHY and I cannot be in two places at the same time. There will be no executive meeting tomorrow at 9:30. We will try to have a meeting off the floor if we can to pass out the judges.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized for 20 minutes.

OIL ROYALTIES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, last week a group of Senators announced they had reached an agreement to open more offshore areas to oil drilling. For the first time, they would allow nearby States, under their proposal, to share in the oil royalties from drilling in Federal waters.

I have come to the floor tonight to say that while I am very hopeful the Senate can come to agreement on a plan that provides significantly more relief to the areas that have been ravaged by Hurricane Katrina, I am also hopeful that the Senate will use this opportunity to finally address a current program, a current royalty relief program, that is out of control and is diverting billions of dollars away from the Federal Treasury.

What the Senate is going to confront, apparently next week, is the prospect that while there is a royalty relief program now that needs to be fixed and has not been fixed, the Senate is going to start a new royalty relief program.

Usually, the first thing you do is fix the program that is not working today before you start anything else. Apparently, some would not be supportive of that taking place. I am one who sees this otherwise.

I also think if you can fix the current royalty relief program, where the Government Accountability Office says \$20 billion to possibly \$60 billion is being wasted, you could use that money from

the current program—that even the sponsor, our respected former colleague, Senator Bennett Johnston, says is out of control—you could use that money from the current program, that wastes so much money, and get some of that to these areas that have been ravaged by Katrina.

There were two floods, in effect, that the Congress must now confront. First, we have to help rebuild the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama that were destroyed by the storm surge of August 29 of last year. But the second flood that needs to be stemmed is the flood of billions of dollars of oil royalties that have gone into the pockets of the world's largest oil companies at a time when they have enjoyed extraordinary profits. They have enjoyed tremendous profits. We have seen extraordinary prices, and yet they continue to get these great subsidies.

As I say, if we can clean up the current royalty program, which is so inefficient that even its sponsor thinks is out of control, we will have more money to help these flood-ravaged areas of the gulf that are the legitimate concern of all of my colleagues from those States.

The existing oil royalty giveaways have grown over the years to become the biggest oil subsidy of all and one of the largest boondoggles that wastes taxpayer money of any Federal program.

The General Accountability Office estimates that at a minimum the Federal Government and the taxpayers are going to be out \$20 billion in lost revenues. If the Government loses pending lawsuits, that amount could reach as high as \$80 billion. This comes at a time when, according to the Congressional Research Service, the oil companies are enjoying record profits.

It will be very difficult to explain to the American public how Congress can be proposing to allow additional billions of dollars of royalty money to be given away before it first puts a stop to what is already going out the door.

Now, in opening this discussion tonight—I expect the Senate will look at this formally next week—I want to be very clear in saying that I understand the need of the gulf States to secure Federal funds to restore their coastlines and rebuild their communities. There is no question that Katrina and Rita flattened New Orleans and other communities up and down the gulf coast, and that there is a clear need for all Americans, including my constituents at home in Oregon, to be part of going to bat for our fellow Americans.

But I do hope, fervently, that as the Senate looks to find additional resources for these gulf States, the Senate will not be given a false choice between either aiding the gulf States or standing up for the public interest in the face of the outrageous oil company windfalls now being paid for today. We can and should do both.

Helping the victims of Katrina is not mutually exclusive from helping taxpayers. It is possible to do both. And as

I have outlined, if you clean up the oil royalty giveaway that is on the books today, that is so inefficient, you can take those dollars and give some of them to folks in the gulf States that are suffering.

Mr. President, my seatmate, Senator LANDRIEU, for whom I have the greatest respect, is from the great State of Louisiana, and she and other colleagues from the gulf States have come to the floor again and again and again to describe eloquently the devastation their States have faced from these hurricanes. Senator LANDRIEU has been a tireless advocate for her State. They have made a compelling case why Congress and the American people ought to provide real assistance to these communities.

Like my colleagues, like Senators of both parties, I want to help the hurricane victims in the gulf rebuild. But I also do not want to continue wasting taxpayer money in unnecessary giveaways to oil companies that have been raking in gushers of cash in the past few years.

As I indicated earlier when we talked about this subject at length on the floor of the Senate, the mistakes that were made in the current royalty relief program have been bipartisan. Certainly, the Clinton administration muffed the ball back in the 1990s when they did not step in and put a solid price threshold on this program. That caused a significant amount of money to be given away. But the mistakes made by the Clinton administration were compounded by Secretary Gale Norton in the Bush administration, and also by the Congress in the energy bill, which continued to sweeten the current royalty relief program.

So citizens and taxpayers have a bit of history: The current oil royalty relief program, which is such a colossal waste of taxpayer money, began when oil was \$19 a barrel, and has been continuing at a time when oil has been well over \$70 a barrel.

So I think it is important for the Senate to look at ways to provide additional help to the needs of the gulf States without turning a blind eye to this boondoggle that is on the books today—the oil royalty giveaway program that came about in the 1990s.

A possible solution to the current predicament is to use some of the money from the program, which does not work, to try to provide an additional boost of funding for the gulf States at present. Reforming the current royalty program could provide more money for areas hit by hurricanes and possibly other urgent priorities.

As long as we are on that subject, I would very much like to see some of the money that now goes to this inefficient oil royalty giveaway program used for the Secure Rural Schools legislation that is so important in my home State and much of the West and the South.

The oil companies are supposed to pay royalties to the Federal Govern-

ment when they extract oil from Federal lands. But in order to stimulate production of oil in our country—this was back when oil was \$19 a barrel—the Federal Government has been giving oil producers what has been known as royalty relief for some period of time.

Royalty relief is a nice way of saying that the oil companies are taking something from the American people without paying for it. That relief now amounts to billions of taxpayer dollars that are given away to companies that do not need them.

In fact, the President has said that with the price of oil at \$55 a barrel, companies do not need incentives at all to drill for oil. That is the President of the United States, not some anti-oil advocate. The President of the United States has said that you do not need incentives with the price of oil above \$55 a barrel. In fact, with prices shooting up to more than \$75 a barrel—more than \$20 higher than the price the President said meant there should not be any subsidies—I do not see how you can make a case at all for the current out-of-control oil royalty giveaway.

I am not the only person who is making this argument. For example, in May, a few weeks after I spent about 5 hours on the floor talking about this program, the other body, the House, held a historic vote to put an end to taxpayer-funded royalty giveaways to profitable oil companies. The House of Representatives, the other body, voted overwhelmingly, on a bipartisan basis, to put a stop to this waste of taxpayer dollars.

So what I spent 5 hours talking about on the floor of the Senate earlier this year—and Senators were saying: What is the point of this? What are going to be the implications? I think it is important to note that a few weeks after I took that time on the floor of this great body, the other body voted overwhelmingly to cut these unnecessary subsidies.

Even officials in the oil industry are saying that you cannot make a case for this multibillion-dollar subsidy at this time. The architect of the program, our respected former colleague, Senator Bennett Johnston, has said that what has taken place with respect to the royalty relief program is far removed from what he had in mind when he wrote the program.

Now, I believe the Senate ought to have another opportunity to debate and vote on the oil royalty issue, just as the other body did this spring. I was unable, earlier this year, despite being close to 5 hours on the floor, to even get an up-or-down vote on my proposal to stop ladling out tens of billions of dollars of unnecessary subsidies to the oil industry.

It seems to me if the U.S. Senate is going to vote on a new royalty scheme that will involve, again, enormous sums of money, the Senate certainly should have the opportunity to vote on reforming the existing program at that time.

We are, of course, in the middle of the summer driving season. This is a time of the year when our citizens drive more, as they go on summer vacations, when demand for gas goes up, and when prices at the pump continue to escalate. I am sure our citizens, who are now facing the highest gas prices ever at this time of the year, will be interested to know when the Senate will have a chance to vote on the question of whether, at this time of record prices, oil companies making record profits should continue to get record taxpayer subsidies in the form of royalty relief.

Along with several colleagues, I have written to the distinguished majority leader asking for the Senate to hold an up-or-down vote on ending royalty relief to profitable oil companies before the August recess. I will continue to press for a floor vote on reforming the oil royalty program at the earliest possible opportunity. I am going to do everything I can to see that this vote happens in a fashion that will expedite aid to the people and communities in the Gulf States who await our best efforts.

It is my understanding that the legislation to open up more offshore areas to oil drilling will come up under expedited procedures next week. I am going to work with colleagues who I know have a great interest in this. I have already spoken with Senator KYL, for example, who helped me greatly when we tried to roll back the oil royalty program earlier this year. I have also spoken with Senators LOTT and LANDRIEU and Chairman DOMENICI. I will continue to have those discussions. I simply wanted to take the time tonight, with the Senate having completed business for the week, to go through some of the implications of this offshore oil drilling program that will be debated next week.

What it comes down to is, before you start a brandnew program that will involve vast sums, you ought to clean up one that is on the books today and is currently out of control, wasting billions of dollars, according to the Government Accountability Office. Secondly, if you clean up the program that doesn't work today, you save some dollars and you can apply them to those devastated gulf States which have such a great need.

I intend to talk about this further next week. I do think it is time for the Senate to start thinking about the implications of what happens if you start a new program and you haven't fixed the one on the books today that even its author thinks is completely out of control and far removed from what he intended.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today we have the opportunity to do something very important for a precious national resource: our children.

We must seize this opportunity and approve H.R. 4472, the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006.

As the father of six and the grandfather of 22, and about to be 23, my heart reaches out to parents whose children become the victims of sexual predators.

I cannot imagine what a nightmare that must be.

And as a legislator, I want to assure those parents that we are doing all we can to make certain this never happens again.

I am very confident that due to passing this legislation, there will be fewer sex offender victims in America, and fewer sex offenders roaming free.

This bill has enjoyed vast bipartisan support. When Senator BIDEN and I first introduced the legislation in the Senate, in the form of S. 1086 the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act—42 Senators quickly signed on as cosponsors.

In particular, I thank for their support my colleague from Utah, BOB BENNETT, and Senator GRASSLEY. I also thank Representative MARK FOLEY who introduced a companion bill in the House and Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER, who moved this through the House Judiciary Committee.

Majority Leader BILL FRIST and Speaker HASTERT are to be applauded for coming together to make sure this bill passed. I thank them all.

Technology of the 21st century, such as DNA testing, has empowered law enforcement to identify, prosecute, and punish sex offenders—the most despicable of criminals—as never before.

But advanced technology has also empowered sexual predators in way that outrages and disgusts me.

Some have compared the Internet to an “open game preserve” where sex offenders can prey on vulnerable children, meeting them in chat rooms and luring them into horrible situations.

Pedophiles use the web to hunt our children; now we will start using the web to hunt down sexual predators when this bill passes.

Today, there are more than 500,000 registered sex offenders in the United States.

Unfortunately, many of them receive limited sentences and roam invisibly through our communities.

With too many, we don't know where they are until it is too late.

We have tried tracking sex offenders through Web sites before, but these sites are virtually useless because the information is frequently wrong and outdated.

Most offenders register once a year, by mail. Moreover, state Web sites do not correspond with each other, and sex offenders are under penalty of only a misdemeanor if they lie or just decide not to participate. There are 150,000 out there that we do not know where they are.

This bill will enhance the web technology available for tracking convicted sex offenders and replace outdated, inaccurate Web sites with meaningful tools to protect children.

It will be a searchable national Web site that interacts with state sites.

Citizens in every state will be able to inform themselves about predators in their communities with accurate information.

Under this legislation, offenders will be required to report regularly to the authorities in person, and let them know when they move or change jobs.

And if they don't want to follow the rules, they will go to jail, because failure to provide truthful information will become a felony.

Those who break such a sacred trust and harm our children, no matter who they are, where they are from, or where they commit their crime, will have obligations under this law to make their whereabouts known voluntarily or subject themselves to additional prison time.

The bill also provides money to put tracking devices on high-risk sex offenders who are released from jail. If we convict these monsters, we can't lose track of them.

These are all common-sense solutions to a dark and horrible problem in our society.

We have all heard with horror the tales of sexual predators.

One of those tales that has captured national headlines comes from my home state of Utah. Elizabeth Smart, then a 14-year-old girl, was kidnapped from her home in 2002. Miraculously, she was rescued nine months later.

Since then, she and her father, Ed Smart, have vigorously labored on behalf of sex-crime victims and laws to help them, including this law.

Ed and Elizabeth have joined me in the Senate today. I thank them publicly, both for standing up and for fighting back. It means so much to all of us.

I have come to know and love them both, and I am grateful for the devotion they have shown for the children of this country.

This bill will call for the creation of a new office within the Department of Justice—called the SMART Office—the Director of which will be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. SMART is an acronym which represents the reaffirmed efforts of the Justice Department to, Sentence—Monitor—Apprehend—Register—and Track, sex offenders. It is also named after Elizabeth Smart.

I thank the Department of Justice for their commitment to the issues of sex offenders, child pornography and the creation of the SMART Office—and I want to, again, thank the Smart family for their active participation in this debate and for helping to move this bill forward.

This legislation is truly “smart” legislation.

Also included in this legislation are child protection provisions first introduced in the House by Representative MIKE PENCE, and which I introduced here in the Senate.

This legislation will help prevent children from participating in the production of sexually explicit material.

It strengthens current law by requiring producers of sexually explicit material to keep records regarding the identity and age of performers.

I thank the Senator from Kansas, Senator BROWNBACK, who was this bill's original cosponsor, and the 29 other Senators, on both sides of the aisle, who joined as cosponsors of this bill.

As my colleagues are aware, Congress previously approved the PROTECT Act of 2003 against the backdrop of Department of Justice regulations applying recordkeeping statutes to both primary and secondary producers.

Along with the act's specific reference to the regulatory definition that existed at the time, this signaled Congress's agreement with the Department's view that it already had the authority to regulate secondary producers.

A Federal court in Colorado, however, recently enjoined the Department from enforcing the statute against secondary producers, a decision that conflicted with a DC court ruling on this point.

Title V of the Adam Walsh Act will eliminate any doubt that the recordkeeping statute applies to both primary and secondary producers. It clearly expresses Congress's agreement with the Department's regulatory approach and gives the Department the tools to enforce the statute.

I want to thank the American press corps for the attention it has given to this issue. News outlets have diligently raised the American public's awareness of the grave threat posed by today's sexual predators. And the press have followed the lead of John Walsh, host of “America's Most Wanted.” He and his wife, Reve, have waited nearly 25 years for the passage of this bill.

Next Thursday, July 27, 2006, marks 25 years since the abduction and murder of their son Adam. And on that 25th anniversary, it is our hope the President will sign into law legislation that will help law enforcement do what John has been doing all along—hunt down predators and criminals.

Ernie Allen, president of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, along with Robbie Callaway, John Libonati, and Carolyn Atwell-Davis were also very prominent spokespeople for this legislation, and I want to personally thank them.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children is one of the unsung heroes in the efforts to stop the abduction, exploitation, and murder of children. Their staff works long hours, and their commitment to stopping child pornography and sexual assault against kids is hard to match.

I am grateful that the Senate will soon act on this bill. In the preamble to our Nation's great Constitution, we the people promise to establish justice, promote the general welfare, and provide for the common defense. There is no defense more sacred, nor welfare more precious, than those of our children.

Currently, we track library books in this country better than we do sex offenders. With this measure, however, law enforcement will have the best means possible to protect our Nation's most precious national resource: our children.

Now, I appreciate the help of all of my colleagues. I certainly appreciate this time from the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma because I wanted to make this statement, and this was a good time to make it. I am grateful to him for providing the time. I yield back the remainder of my time and ask everybody in the Senate to vote for this bill.

VIOLENCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I rise to speak about the situation in the Middle East. As we have seen, the missiles are continuing to fly, the fighting continues, the situation gets volatile. This morning, another Hezbollah rocket attack—this time on Nazareth—caused the death of two more Israelis. So it is vitally important that we seriously discuss this issue.

Israel and its immediate neighbor Lebanon are in a state of peril that concerns the entire world. If I had one point to make this morning, it is this: President Bush is correct to fully support Israel in her effort to bring peace, to bring the soldiers home, to prevent missiles from flying on the northern fifth of Israel.

Mr. President, 1.2 million people are living in shelters. That is a fifth of the entire population. Israel has an inherent right as a sovereign nation not only to secure her borders but to defend herself from outside attack. I am urging the President to continue to stand tall and give Israel the space she needs, the time she needs, to defend herself and make sure that these missiles cannot continue to rain down upon her people at Hezbollah's will.

There is a great deal of pressure from the European community and from others that Israel should not be given the ability to defend herself. In short, if we were to prevent Israel from doing everything she could to stop these rockets from flying down on her people, we would be back where we are now 3 months, 6 months, a year from now, in the same situation.

So should there be peace and negotiations? Yes. Might it be possible eventually to have an international force in southern Lebanon? Perhaps, although many of us who believe in Israel are worried about that force because in the past it has not stopped terrorist attacks on Israel. But at the moment, we cannot allow the status quo to continue, where a militant terrorist organization, Hezbollah, has the ability to rain torture down on the northern part of Israel.

Israel must be allowed to defend herself like any nation. Can you imagine if some group were operating in Canada and continued to fire missiles at Buf-

falo and Detroit and Minneapolis and Seattle? Would the rest of the world tell the U.S. "show restraint" even though every night a hundred missiles came down on the cities, even though millions of people might be living in shelters? Of course not.

Every country has the right to defend herself. Israel is no exception. I salute President Bush for understanding that and hope he continues on that course because any other course, any appeasement of Hezbollah, will lead to this same sorry situation repeating itself.

Let's be clear: The state of Israel is not an aggressor here. Israel has stated over and over again its desire to live in peace with the Arab world. It is Israel's policy to allow a Palestinian state. And there are some in the Palestinian and Arab world who agree with it. But there are some who do not.

Hezbollah believes Israel has no right to exist, not simply in the West Bank and Gaza but in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem and Ashdod and Ashkelon. And Hezbollah has said they will do all they can to eradicate the state of Israel. Hezbollah is the aggressor.

I feel deeply for those who are injured, both Israeli and Lebanese, both Jew and Arab. But the Lebanese Government also has an obligation here; that is, not to allow terrorists to operate on her soil. I was so pleased to see that Saudi Arabia and other countries in the Arab world understand that Hezbollah is the provocateur here. But the world must unite against terrorism. The sad lesson we learn is that if terrorism is first directed at one country, it will inevitably spread, unless we have a strong, united world against terrorism.

In this case, Israel is not the aggressor. She is defending herself against an unlawful incursion into her borders by the terrorist organization Hezbollah. Hezbollah has rockets, and they shoot indiscriminately at civilians. Israel, on the other hand, in defending herself, goes out of her way and sacrifices the lives of her soldiers not to punish and hurt civilians. It is awfully difficult when people store missiles in their garages and in their homes.

But all Israel asks for is the ability to defend herself. To create some moral equivalency between Israel's response to these rocket attacks and the terrorist attacks themselves is, in my opinion, immoral. What other country would allow it? Would Prime Minister Chirac stand for restraint if missiles rained from Switzerland to Lyon? Would President Putin ask for restraint? Why he asks for restraint against terrorists in the Middle East but asks for world support against terrorists in Chechnya is beyond me. He seems to have a double standard.

Would any country simply watch as dozens of its own citizens were killed, countless more injured, the whole nation frantic with fear and uncertainty? No, of course not. Every nation would respond with strength and do every-

thing it could to eradicate the terrorists. And that is just what Israel is doing now.

Prime Minister Olmert has publicly called for peace. He is right to do so. Israel did not seek out this conflict and does not seek its continuance. But neither will nor should Israel back down and simply allow Hezbollah to continue its reign of terror over Israel and its citizens at any time of its choosing.

So this is a sad situation. Lebanon's entire population is paying the price for Hezbollah's outrageous actions. The Prime Minister, Siniora, said in a statement:

Lebanon cannot grow and develop if the government is the last to know and yet the first to pay the price.

The great mistake was allowing Hezbollah into the government and then allowing them free reign in southern Lebanon. It should not be a mistake that Lebanon repeats, and it should not be a mistake to which the world acquiesces.

Lebanese Prime Minister Siniora has called for his government to assert "sovereignty in all Lebanese territory." I agree with this. You cannot have a terrorist separate nation living within your nation and then disclaim any responsibility and blame the country that is simply defending itself against terror.

As I said, I welcome the stance of Saudi Arabia and Egypt and Jordan and Kuwait, which characterized Hezbollah's actions as "unexpected, inappropriate and irresponsible." This is a welcome stance, a new stance. But talk is cheap. We should hold the Arab League's feet to the fire and pressure them to take concrete steps that will force Hezbollah to stop its attacks and return the captured soldiers.

In short, our President is doing the right thing. Americans of all political philosophies and all parties back him in doing it. Our plea, Mr. President: Stay the course. Continue strong. Let Israel, who does not ask for United States troops or United States casualties in any way—defend herself. All she needs is the support of the world to help her fight terrorism, a terrorism which could afflict any one of our nations.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I think this may be the first time I have had occasion to stand on the floor and associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York. I appreciate his thoughtful remarks.

PRESIDENT'S VETO OF H.R. 810

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I just watched the President of the United States veto the bill that passed here yesterday by 63 votes, the bill to provide that our scientists in this country, under the guidance of the National Institutes of Health, could conduct life-saving research on embryonic stem cells, with strong ethical guidelines.